

## REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 8 as being unpatentable over Champ et al. (US 6 189 407) and Liebig (US 3 911 782), but he has indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if re-written to overcome the objections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 has been amended with a view to overcoming the Examiner's objection under 35 USC 112. Also the subject matter of claim 9 has been included in claim 1 and claim 9 has been cancelled.

Claim 1 should therefore be patentable as amended.

Claims 2 – 8 all depend on claim 1 and therefore include all the features of claim 1. They are directed to features considered to be advantageous in connection with the support device as defined in claim 1.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 – 8 is therefore solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Klaus J. Bach, Reg. No. 26832